



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,154	11/24/1999	PAUL S. GERMSCHIED	33012/274/10	4721

27516 7590 05/23/2006

UNISYS CORPORATION
MS 4773
PO BOX 64942
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942

EXAMINER

WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/448,154

Applicant(s)

GERMSCHIED ET AL.

Examiner

Luke S. Wassum

Art Unit

2167

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): New matter rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).


10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

13. ☐ Other: _____


Luke S. Wassum
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the Applicants' arguments regarding motivation to combine the references of record, these arguments have been addressed in previous Office actions.

Regarding the Applicants' argument that the references fail to teach the claimed administration module, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The claimed administration module is "for permitting a manager...to associate a particular security level with each of said plurality of service requests". Clearly, the disclosure by the De Capitani di Vimercati et al. reference that "The federated administrator specifies global authorizations to access the federated data" anticipates the claimed administration module, a request to access the federated data being a service request.

Regarding the Applicants' argument that the limitation in claim 11 "requesting said first identifier..." has not been addressed by the examiner, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

In the Final Rejection of record, mailed 23 February 2006, this limitation is addressed on page 15, first paragraph.

Regarding the Applicants' argument that the claimed security profile is generated by the data management system is not taught by the prior art of record, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Independent claim 1 contains limitations regarding a security profile that corresponds to a sequence of command language script (for carrying out a service request) and that the security profile is indicative of the security level maintained by the administration module. Since the security level is associated with specific access requests by a manager (i.e., manually), the security profile is merely the stored embodiment of said security levels. Dependent claim 2 includes a limitation that the security profile is generated by the data management system. However, since (according to independent claim 1) the security profile is indicative of the security levels associated with specific access requests, and the security levels are associated with said access requests by the manager, the claimed generation of the security profile can only be interpreted as the mere storage of the collective set of security levels in the database. If this were not the case, then a profile generated by the database management system could not be indicative of the security levels that had been set manually by the manager.

Given that the limitation 'security profiles generated by the database management system' merely means storing the collective security levels associated with specific access requests, the examiner maintains the rejection of record.